DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 207 738 RC 012 910

AUTHOR Montalvo, Frank F.; And Others
TITLE The Mexican American Culture Simulator for Child Welfare. Technical Report.
INSTITUTION Our Lady of the Lake Univ., San Antonio, Tex.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jun 81
GRANT 90-CW-1967
NOTE 19p.; Funded for 1979-1980 by the Children's Bureau, Dept. of Health and Human Services, as having national significance for improving services to the Hispanic community.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; Anglo Americans; *Autoinstructional Aids; *Child Welfare; *Cross Cultural Training; *Cultural Awareness; Cultural Differences; Ethnic Relations; Hispanic American Culture; Independent Study; Learning Modules; *Mexican Americans; Problem Solving; Simulation; Social Differences; *Social Workers; Training Methods; Values
IDENTIFIERS *Mexican American Culture Simulator; Texas (San Antonio)

ABSTRACT

Project staff and experienced child welfare personnel adapted the Culture Simulator to train child welfare caseworkers to have an empathic understanding of minority children and families in order to encourage and support ethnic identity, integrity, and community life. The training technique used 4 self-instructional modules containing 40 critical casework incidents (derived from discussions with 180 San Antonio, Texas, barrio residents) depicting misunderstanding between Mexican American clients and Anglo American child welfare workers due to differences in their sociocultural backgrounds. Trainees (27 non-Hispanic child welfare workers) were instructed to rank the 4 alternative explanations for the misunderstanding in each vignette according to the-best-to-the-least preferred answer. Trainees were given the teaching volumes, each with a test form and rationales, in sequence. After reading the rationales in order of their answer selection, trainees scored their own tests. Results from trainees and 3 control groups (46 child welfare and family service workers tested with single volumes) indicated that significant cumulative learning took place, the technique was equally effective with experienced and inexperienced workers and for those with extensive exposure to the Mexican American community, and the best results were obtained when the modules were followed by discussions designed to integrate the knowledge gained. (Author/CM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

rec 22-09-81

ED207738

TECHNICAL REPORT
THE MEXICAN AMERICAN CULTURE SIMULATOR FOR CHILD WELFARE

Frank F. Montalvo, D.S.W.
Director, Culture Simulator Programs

Tonia T. Lasater, M.S.W.
Child Welfare Consultant and Trainer

Nancy Garza, M.S.W.
Research Assistant

December 1980
(Revised June 1981)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Frank F. Montalvo

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SUMMARY

The training materials and methods described in this report were developed by the Worden School of Social Service, Our Lady of the Lake University of San Antonio, supported by Child Welfare Training Grant Number 90-CW-1967 (SSA Sec 426). The project was funded for 1979-1980 by the Children's Bureau, Department of Health and Human Services, as having national significance for improving services to the Hispanic community.

The project employs an innovative training technique, the Culture Simulator, developed for business people employed by multi-national corporations and educators preparing to teach abroad. As adapted for this project, it involves a self-instructional module consisting of 40 critical casework incidents depicting misunderstanding between client and worker due to differences in their sociocultural backgrounds: in this case, Mexican American clients and Anglo American child welfare workers. The incidents were developed by the project staff and experienced child welfare personnel from 30 group interviews with 180 residents of low income Mexican American communities in San Antonio, Texas in 1980.

This technical report provides a detailed description of the instructional and field testing methods employed, the major limitations of the technique, and the statistical evaluation of the instrument: the Mexican American Culture Simulator for Child Welfare. The results indicate that significant cumulative learning takes place; that it is equally effective with experienced and inexperienced workers and for those with extensive exposure to the Mexican American community; and that the best results are obtained when the self-instruction module is followed by discussions designed to integrate the knowledge gained.

The purpose of culture simulator training is to improve empathic understanding of minority children and families in a manner that encourages and supports their ethnic identity, integrity and community life.

THE WORDEN SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SERVICE
OUR LADY OF THE LAKE UNIVERSITY OF SAN ANTONIO
411 S.W. 24th Street, San Antonio, Texas 78285

RC 012910

Instructional Method

A Culture Simulator is composed of a number of elements: a critical casework incident of about 150 words that depicts a cross-cultural, problematic transaction created by the differences in values, beliefs, or lifestyles between an Hispanic client and non-Hispanic child welfare worker. The incident is written in the form of a vignette or short scene. This is followed by a question that focused on the client-worker interaction and four multiple choice answers which provide alternative explanations for the client's or the worker's behavior. The alternatives suggest the probable causes of the actor's dilemma. Few are totally incorrect.

The trainee is then instructed to choose the best answer and read the corresponding rationale, which explains why the answer that was selected is or is not the best one available. He or she continues selecting alternative answers and reading rationales until the best one is selected and confirmed by its corresponding rationale. It may require as few as one selection or as many as four before the reader continues to the next vignette.

Rationales for the less-than-best alternatives provide opportunities for correcting misconceptions, stereotypes, or less appropriate interventions; rationales for the best answer explain the nature of the traditional value in question and suggest more effective and culturally responsive casework approaches to the situation. The rationales are therefore the key elements in the vignettes and the primary teaching devices used in constructing the module.

The Culture Simulator has the following unique features:

1. It is directly practice-oriented and job-related.
2. It enables the trainee to learn at his own pace, in private, and in a location convenient to him.
3. It involves the trainee in an active problem-solving experience.
4. It exposes trainee to standardized material, which enables him to assess his progress.
5. It assures that all trainees will be exposed to the same material, which controls for variation in the trainer's expertise.
6. It reduces the risk of overgeneralizing and developing "new" stereotypes.
7. It enables trainers with varying backgrounds to utilize the material.
8. It provides for the efficient distribution and utilization of training materials.
9. It facilitates the testing, evaluation, and improvement of teaching materials.
10. It can be used for various educational and research purposes.

The self-instructional module was very well received as a teaching method by workers participating in the project, who saw the technique as a motivative, enjoyable, and informative approach to understanding the Mexican American culture.

The literature in cross-cultural psychology refers to this instructional method as the "culture assimilator".(1) Assimilation, however, implies the replacement of one set of values for another, which is not the intent of training. The authors prefer the term "cultural simulator" to refer to the simulation of cross-cultural interactions that reveal inappropriate responses by persons unacculturated to the community resident's culture. These responses are considered appropriate

to the trainee's own values or are in keeping with sound professional practice within his or her culture. The differences result in conflict, misunderstanding or confusion of either or both the participants in the interactions. As such, the situations are considered to be critical incidents for teaching and learning purposes.

The culture assimilator technique has been most widely developed by the Department of Psychology at the University of Illinois by Dr. Harry C. Triandis. Since 1966, eight instruments dealing with Arabic, Iranian, Greek, Thai, Hondurian and black American cultures have been developed. The Mexican American Culture Simulator for Child Welfare is the first that was developed for the helping professions, focused on family values and prescribed corrective interventions.

Source of Materials

Critical Incidents were gathered by the project staff and twenty one experienced child welfare supervisors, trainers and workers from the Texas Department of Human Resources who comprised the research group in the project. The three-person teams conducted thirty group interviews in English and Spanish throughout San Antonio in 1980. The interviews were arranged with the help of seven community outreach service centers. A total of 180 barrio residents, young and old, male and female, were asked to discuss situations where they felt that a difference in family values, customs or beliefs caused a misunderstanding between themselves and others. The interviews were minimally structured and the participants were allowed to discuss any subject pertaining to their lifestyle that they wished. Only a few residents participated in more than one session. Each session lasted approximately three hours.

By the fifteenth group interview the value themes discussed began to become repetitive and familiar to the project staff, at least one of whom was a member of each interviewing team. This observation enabled the staff to examine the value in question in more detail with the participants and ask about conditions when or situations where it would not apply. The "exhaustion" of value themes during the course of the interviews is an important point. First, it indicated that the basic array of core values was being tapped by the interviewers. Second, it enabled the staff to explore the core values in more detail without risk of overlooking others. Third, it partially met a major criticism of the culture simulator technique: that because of its format it fails to expose the reader to all the major values in the culture. The project's focus on family rather than personal values probably enabled the staff to construct an instrument that included most of the major values.

The Research Group

The selection of experienced child welfare personnel as members of the research group was intentional. It was important that the simulator thoroughly reflect problems and issues that were relevant not only to practice but addressed agency policies and procedures. It was also critical that the workers depicted in the vignettes realistically represented those without masters degree level training and with less than three years of experience, that is, the intended recipients of

culture simulator training. Only a group composed of experienced supervisors, trainers and workers provided the desired agency and worker perspectives.

Since the training recipients were to be primarily non-Hispanic workers, the research group was made up of mostly Anglo Americans (17 of 21). In addition to the two Hispanic staff members, the four Mexican American workers conducted the Spanish language interviews as well as others. This ethnic mix in the project allowed for a comparison of data and for a dual perspective in constructing the training materials. In this manner, the sensitivity of both ethnic groups was dealt with. The results were synergistic -- values and opinions were closely examined and separated from myths and stereotypes and the resulting vignettes and rationales were carefully documented and explained.

The research group was divided into two research subgroups of approximately equal numbers who were subdivided into research teams. The teams met during separate training, field and work sessions for a total of ten days each over a three month period. Each team was given an orientation to Mexican American and Anglo American values based on a review of over 300 literature items, and were trained to conduct field interviews. They were taught to identify and select values themes and develop and construct cultural vignettes prior to conducting the interviews. The total group produced 50 vignettes, 40 of which were selected for training and testing.

Testing Materials and Methods

The 40 vignettes were divided into four volumes in order to provide a convenient method of testing the trainee's learning. When more than one vignette addressed a certain value they they were distributed among the volumes. The relative difficulty to solve a given vignette was not considered since this information was not available at the time. Multiple choice test forms for each volume were made up of the critical incidents, questions, and alternative answers without the accompanying rationales. The pre-post evaluation was composed of the test forms for volume 1 and 4, respectively.

Answer sheets were constructed for each test form. The trainees were instructed to select the four alternatives in each vignette in accordance with the-best-to-the-least preferred answer.

The trainees were then given the teaching volumes (with rationales) in sequence as they completed each of the four test forms and turned in one of their two copies of the answer sheet. With the remaining copy of the answer sheet, the trainees read the rationales in order of their answer selection and scored their own tests. This procedure enabled one to examine individual and group learning curves for trainees across the four volumes and to identify the easy and more difficult vignettes.

The number and per cent of correct responses for individuals and groups were analyzed as well as the response pattern formed by the groups' choice of first, second, third, and fourth answers for each vignette. Also, an improvement rate was tabulated for each group, which was computed by dividing the difference between the pre and post test scores by the difference between the pretest score and the maximum possible score attainable.

A total of 73 subjects were involved in the testing phase: 27 TDHR personnel participated in testing three different training methods (Training Groups C, D, and E); 46 participated in testing individual volumes (Test Groups F, G, and H). Volumes two, three, and four, were tested separately and individually with different subsamples in order to determine whether the training groups' improved scores were due to chance or cumulative learning. The subsample scores were uniformly lower than the training groups' scores indicating that cumulative learning took place for the latter.

Major Limitations of Instructional and Testing Methods

1. The project was subject to the realities and limitations of conducting field research and training in a large scale service organization. In spite of excellent administrative cooperation from many regional offices, last minute unavailability of subjects, unclear directions from the project's office, and the loss of subjects because of caseload emergencies underscored the real difference between "pure" laboratory testing and relevant field research. As developmental research, the staff initiated new inquiry based on the emerging data, developed new working hypothesis, and sought samples to test them in order to strengthen the training designs and goals of the project.

In spite of the small size and mixed characteristics of the subsamples the module was tested rather vigorously in view of its early stage of development. The X^2 contingency test was used for samples with less than 12 subjects and the t test way used to compare the means of samples with 12 or more subjects. These results are presented in Table I, Child Welfare Project Results.

2. Another technical limitation concerns the traditional instructional format that was utilized in this project for providing feedback. The branching format allows for self-paced learning, but does not fully exploit the potential for learning that can take place by the trainee's reading all the 160 rationales in the module. Trainees and supervisors often report that a less-than-best answer may have been rejected because of guessing or for an inappropriate, unclear, or wrong reason. The branching format fails to correct and clarify why the rejected answer was a poor explanation and fails to deepen and reinforce the trainee's understanding.

An instruction procedure that takes somewhat longer to self-administer, but requires the trainee to read all the rationales, is known as the "linear" format. (2). The procedure requires the development of a standardized scale against which the trainees compare the degree of confidence they have in their answer choices. Recent experiments reported in the literature on this new method indicate that the linear format is superior in improving their ability to solve more difficult vignettes. The feasibility of using the linear format in this project will be examined during on-going refinements of the instrument. Neither format, however, addresses the following technical limitation, which also fails to capitalize on all the material contained in the module.

3. It should be noted that the test form of volume four only measures the learning that is gained from among the 120 rationales in the previous three teaching volumes. Rationales from volume four are reviewed by the trainees only after they have scored and submitted their answer to the test form of that volume. Consequently, only the

impact of 75% of the module (three of the four volumes) has been measured thus far. Several alternative pre-post tests, that do not require the development of additional vignettes, are being examined to test the full teaching potential of the module.

Solutions to these technical limitations are expected to greatly improve the effectiveness of the simulator without diminishing its efficiency.

4. The present form of the module has not been tested and validated with known groups of experts from the Mexican American community. Partial content validity is offered since the critical incidents and rationales were developed from interviews with members of the Mexican American barrio communities in San Antonio.

5. The module does not purport to teach the trainee about the total distribution of values and beliefs that exist in the community, nor about the extent and depth to which they are held. Rather, it attempts to teach non-Hispanic workers about the more traditional or core values that are related to the family and are held by many Mexican Americans. This approach was based on its relevancy for practice with urban and rural poor and migratory workers who tend to adhere to traditional values and on its potential application to Mexican Americans and Hispanics in other parts of the United States.

6. The risk of stereotyping or overgeneralizing materials presented in cultural awareness training is common. This training module is also not immune to this danger, although steps were taken to minimize the risk. Most of the focal and operative values dipicted in the incidents appear as secondary values in other vignettes. Consequently, a value or belief that best explains why a misunderstanding took place in one incident is a possible but not the best explanation in another. This was done in order to emphasize the point that circumstances and relationships often influence the specific value that is acted upon from a cluster of cultural alternatives.

7. Finally, culture is not taught simply. The module only claims to provide an introduction to the Mexican American culture and does not pretend to offer an in-depth understanding of the people's lifestyle. The purpose is to facilitate the development of an alternative perspective of practice and to encourage self-motivated study and additional training for non-Hispanics who have primary responsibility for serving the Mexican American community.

The biggest risk and limitation in using this training approach is that it would be viewed as sufficient for effective practice. Hence, our recommendation is that it be used as an educational tool by trainers and supported by more specific training and testing. The field supervisor's assessment of the worker's performance will constitute the ultimate test of the module's effectiveness. Such behavioral measures are rare in the state-of-the-art of cultural awareness training. Consideration is being given, however, to developing performance criteria during the continuation and refinement of culture simulators.

Preliminary Statistical Analysis

All training and test group results must be viewed as Tentative in view of the small samples involved and the weak control of independent variables resulting in the lack of matched groups. This underscores the difficulty of conducting research under field conditions. The statistics discussed below are presented in table form at the end of this report.

Training Group Characteristics

Group C

Composition: 7 non-Hispanic child welfare workers with from 2 to 7 years tenure and an average of almost 6 years in TDHR. None had post-graduate degrees and they represented different sections of Central and South Texas.

Training: 4.5 days of cultural awareness training which included basic concepts in minority intergroup relations; clarification of cultural values; vignette analysis and construction; community field interviews; and experience in preparing and writing cultural vignettes.

Test: Pre-post forms composed of 20 casework vignettes evenly divided into two volumes (1 and 4).

Group D

Composition: 8 non-Hispanic child welfare workers with from 3 to 9 years tenure with an everage of 7 years in TDHR, None had post-graduate degrees and they represented different sections of Central and South Texas.

Training: Two days of cultural awareness training using the four volume module with 40 casework vignettes, and 120 teaching rationales. Approximately two hours of discussion following the administration of each volume.

Tests: Pre-post test forms composed of 20 casework vignettes evenly divided into two volumes (1 and 4). Test forms for volumes 2 and 3 were used to measure the learning process between the pre-post tests.

Group E

Composition: 12 non-Hispanic child welfare workers with from 1 month to 3 years tenure and an average of less than 1.5 years with TDHR. None had post-graduate degrees and they worked in a smaller than average West Texas community with a relatively large Mexican-American population.

Training: Two hours of training using the four volume module with 40 casework vignettes and 120 rationales used for self-instruction.

Tests: Pre-post test forms composed of 20 casework vignettes evenly divided into two volumes (1 and 4). Test forms for volumes 2 and 3 were used to measure the learning process between the pre-post tests.

Evaluation Results

The Training Groups: 4.5 days, 2 days and Simulator Training only

Over Four Days Training vs. Two Days Training

Group C increased its selection of correct answers by 21% from 43% in volume 1 to 64% in volume 4; Group D increased by 16% from 55% to 71%. In terms of the relative potential for improvement for each group, both groups improved at a similar rate, 38% and 36%, respectively. Group C's improvement was significant at the .02 level, Group D's at .05.

The impression gained form this initial, small sample testing was that two days of training using the teaching module with discussion, clarification, and elaboration of values appeared to be as effective in identifying the correct answers as the more extensive training conducted by the staff.

As an important cautionary note, however, it was also observed that those with a more extensive training made fewer poor choices on 20 pre-post test items as defined by selecting the correct answer on the fourth and last try, than those undergoing two days of training. Five percent (7/140) of Group C's choices were poor, while 13% (21/160) of Group D's correct choices were made on the fourth try. Therefore, longer periods of training may serve to decrease mistakes rather than increase correct responses. The between group difference was statistically significant at the .02 level.

This difference may reflect a limited ability of the test instrument to tap, except indirectly, the greater pool of knowledge possessed by some subjects, since no array of test items can address all the value themes in a given culture.

Self-Instructional Module Training vs. Longer Training

Based on the module's encouraging positive results, an attempt was made to test the power of the instrument more fully. The module was administered to a group of less experienced child welfare workers (Group E) after 60% of the vignettes had been revised and made more difficult to solve. The group underwent the modular training without the benefit of the discussion periods given to Group D. As such, the content, procedure, and subject characteristics presented a more severe test of the instrument to teach cultural awareness to non-Hispanic workers.

The results were that Group E increased its pre-post test scores by 25% (from 42% correct to 67% correct) and improved at a rate of 42% between scores. The improvement was significant at the .01 level. This was a larger increase and a greater improvement rate than either Group C or D.

Group E's poor choice total, however, approximated Group D's 13% in that 12% (28/240) of that group's pre-post test answers were chosen on the last try. The difference between Group E and Group C was statistically significant at the .05 level.

The conclusion was drawn that utilizing the module without providing additional information appeared to be at least as effective in choosing correct answers as the other training methods and was superior in cost-effectiveness; approximately 90% more than Group C and 75% more than Group D.

It can be demonstrated through an alternate analysis that all groups improved by their selecting progressively fewer alternatives before arriving at the correct answer during the course of training. When the distribution of attempts was summarized according to the first-to-fourth placement of the correct answer in each vignette, consistent, but somewhat different learning patterns emerged for each group. Group C selected the correct answer only 3 times as its first choice in Volume 1, but 9 times out of a possible 10 in Volume 4; Group D's first place selection increased from 6 to 9; and Group E's selection increased from 5 to 7. Group D's remaining preference, however, was placed second, while Group C's was placed a poor fourth, thus indicating that Group D reached a near perfect score by Volume 4. By this analysis, Group D's exposure to the module plus discussion was the most effective training method employed.

An explanation of this method of analysis and a full display of the group's learning patterns are provided at the end of this report. (See Table 2).

Testing for Cumulative Learning. The Test Groups

Volumes 2, 3, and 4 were administered separately to three TDHR groups that became available to testing during the course of the project. The purpose of this procedure was to compare to the extent possible, the cumulative learning that took place from one volume to the next by training groups against the scores obtained by participants who were not exposed to other volumes. The test groups were expected to score lower on a given volume than the comparable training groups.

These tests also helped to identify the relative difficulty of individual vignettes without their contamination by the subjects' previous learning. Volume 1's use as a pre-test for the training groups served this same purpose.

Test Groups F, G, and H, differed in certain characteristics from the Groups C, D, and E, and from each other, which were partially reflected in the results.

Group F (n=17) was composed of family service workers with an average tenure of four years which ranged from 1.5 to 12 years with TDHR. They worked in relatively smaller communities which contained few Mexican Americans. This group tested volume 2 and chose 24% correct answers. This was close to half the scores (22% and 28%) obtained for that volume by Group D, 46%, and Group E, 52%. The Group F and E difference was significant at the .01 level.

Group G (n=13) was composed of child welfare workers with an average of five years experience, ranging from one to 11 years. They practiced in small to moderate size communities with a proportionately significant Mexican American population. This group tested volume 2 and obtained a score of 39% correct. This was at least 10% less (10% and 11%) than Group D, 49%, and Group E, 50%. The difference between groups G and E was statistically significant at .02 level.

Group H (n=16) was composed of family service workers with over seven years experience and ranged from two to 14.5 years on the job. They worked in a large metropolitan community with a significant Mexican American population. This group tested volume 4 and scored a high 47% correct. However, this was 17% lower than Group C, 64%, 24% lower than Group D, 71%, and 20% lower than Group E, 67%. The difference was significant at the .05 level between Groups H and E.

In all situations, the test groups' scores were from 10% to 28% lower than those obtained by training groups. Even the high score of 47% obtained by Group H on volume 4 was 17% less than the lowest score obtained by a training group, Group C (64%).

These preliminary finding strengthen the proposition that the higher scores obtained by training groups are due to the cumulative learning that resulted from exposure to the teaching module.

Tenure, Community Size and Ethnic Density as Variables

The 23% difference between Group F and Group H test results is striking and significant at the .01 level. It is not completely accounted for by the possible differences in the difficulty of the volumes administered for testing; they both varied to a somewhat similar extent from the same training gorups (Group F, 22-28% less, and Group H, 20-24% less). Some of the differences between Group F's and H's scores may be attibuted to the marked differences in their average tenure, 4 years and 7 years, respectively, to the difference in their practice experience and the greater proportion of Mexican Americans in Group H's community than in Group F's.

Community size was not believed to be a critical factor since other subjects who practiced in smaller communities (for example, in Groups D and E) did not score lower than Group H, although the groups are not strictly comparable.

Tenure in TDHR, or years of practice, turned out to be a weak variable upon closer examination. This was initially suggested by Group E's good performance, since this gorup averaged only 1.5 years of practice. When tenure was controlled for both Group F and H, it was discovered that whatever difference existed it was in favor of less tenured workers. For example, those with less than the average tenure in Group F, which was 4.6 years, selected 26% correct answers while those above the mean selected 20%. For Group H, those below the mean of 7.4 years selected 58% correct answers while those above selected only 33%; the remarkable 25% difference was significant at the .01 level. When Test Group G results were also analyzed there was no real difference between the shorter and longer tenured workers, 40% vs. 39% respectively. The mean years in practice for this last group was also only 3.9.

In fact, when extreme tenure cut off points were selected for all test groups, three or less years for shorter term and six or more years for longer term, a similar pattern emerged. The mean years for shorter term workers was 1.7 years (n=10) and their correct score was 35%; the mean years for longer term workers was 8.9 years (n=19) and their total correct score was 33%.

The only factor reported that could account for the difference between Group F and Group H scores, is the difference in the proportionately greater number of Mexican Americans in the latter's community. Unfortunately, there wasn't another sub-sample available with a similarly scarce Hispanic population that would allow for verification of this proposition. Training Group E has demonstrated that extensive learning can take place when there is extensive exposure, and Training Group D suggests that relatively high initial scores do not preclude extensive improvement.

One last point is emphasized by the comparative test group results. It was proposed earlier in this report that extensive training appears to minimize the extent to which one makes poor choices more than it improves one's comparative ability to select correct answers on a test instrument. This point is reinforced by the test groups' percent of poor, last choices, which averaged 12%, and was similar to Group D's two-day training (13%) and Group E's modular training (12%). The reader should also remember that the results fo the analysis of answer preferences (Table 2) indicated that Group D's modular-plus-discussion training seemed superior to Group E's training with the module only. Nevertheless, Group C which underwent 4.5 days of field training, failed the least in choosing the correct answer by ghe fourth try 5%.

If this finding is borne out by further research, it is of more than technical interest. It supports the contention that practitioners should be judged as much, if not more, by the mistakes they do not make than by the correct actions they do take.

Nevertheless, the test group data have generated more information than expected and answered more questions than were asked at the start of the project.

Conclusions

All training groups showed significant increase in their knowledge of the Mexican American culture and in cumulative learning even when only 75% of the teaching potential of the instrument was tested. Culture Simulator training proved to be cost effective when compared to other training approaches.

The training was equally effective with experienced and inexperienced caseworkers, indicating that the vignettes primarily tested and taught knowledge about the culture rather than about casework.

Improvement occured even among workers with extensive exposure to the Mexican American community.

The results argue for supplementing modular training with extensive discussion and supervised experience as an optimum approach to improving the module's effectiveness.

Teaching Module and Trainer's Manual

The relative difficulty of individual vignettes was compared and examined according to the percent obtaining correct answers for each on pre-tests (Volume 1 by Training Groups C, D, and E; and Volume 2 by Test Group F; Volume 3 by Test Group G; and Volume 4 by Test Group H). See Table 3 for results.

This procedure provided the initial basis to construct a new module composed of two volumes with 20 items each and containing a similar range of less-to-more difficult vignettes and matched, as much as possible, according to value themes.

A two-volume teaching module is believed to be an optimum division since training groups reported experiencing significant fatique during the administration of Volume 4. The division provides for separate administration of 20 vignettes and 80 rationales followed by a discussion session and subsequent evaluation of practice before administering the second volume. A month's interval between volumes is proposed as an experiment to allow for effective integration and testing of knowledge gained.

A trainer's manual has been developed to accompany the teaching materials. Its purpose is to assist trainers to conduct discussions that help clarify, amplify, and integrate the information contained in the vignettes. It includes instructions for administering the modular training, additional background information in the form of a list of comparative family values and characteristics, and a detailed analysis of each vignette contained in the module. The vignette analysis include discussions of the implications that each incident has for child welfare practice and bibliographic citations to which the trainer can refer for additional information.

The three volume set is the first in a series of cross-cultural training materials utilizing the culture simulator technique that are being prepared by the Worden School of Social Service at Our Lady of the Lake University of San Antonio under the Supervision of the project director.

References:

1. Fiedler, F.E., Mitchell, T.R., & Triandis, H.D. The culture assimilator: An approach to cross-cultural training. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1971, 55, 95-102

2. Malpass, R.S. & Salancik, G.R. Linear and branching formats in culture assimilator training. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 1977, 1, 76-87

TABLE 1

CHILD WELFARE PROJECT RESULTS

	CHARACTERISTICS						
	Training Groups			Test Groups			
Designation	C	D	E	F	G	H	
Sample Size	7	8	12	17	13	16	
Average Years Tenure	6	7	1.5	4	5	7	
Practice Field (a)	Child Welfare			FS	CW	FS	
Mex./Amer Pop. (b)	(Varied)	(Varied)	Ext	Min	Mod	Mod	
Training Period	4.5 Days	2 Days	2 Hrs.	Not Applicable			
Maximum Score (c)	70	80	120	170	130	160	
	NUMBER AND PER CENT CORRECT						SIGN. LEVEL (t)
Volume 1	30(.43)	44(.55)	51(.42)				
Volume 2		37(.46)	63(.52)	41(.24)			F vs E(.01)
Volume 3		39(.49)	60(.50)		51(.39)		G vs E(.02)
Volume 4	45(.64)	57(.71)	80(.67)			75(.47)	H vs E(.05)
Difference Vol. 4-1	15(.21)	13(.16)	29(.25)				
Improvement & Rate (d)	.38	.36	.42				
Significance Level X^2 (t)*	.02	.05	(.01)				
C vs D Fourth Choice	___ .02 __						
C vs E Fourth Choice	_____ .05 __						

a. FS = Family Service; CW = Child Welfare

b. Mexican American population in community in proportion to non-Hispanics. Ext. = Extensive, Min. = Minimal, Varied = subjects from different communities, Mod = Moderate.

c. Used as basis for computing percent. Maximum score attainable is the sample size times ten vignettes on which each subject was tested.

d. Improvement rate = $\frac{\text{(post-test score) - (pre-test score)}}{\text{(Maximum score) - (pre-test score)}}$

* X^2 test used with less than 12 subjects and tested for number of correct and incorrect items. The t test used with 12 or more subjects; significance levels are in parenthesis.

TABLE 2

PREFEREED ANSWER PATTERNS

	GROUP C					GROUP D					GROUP E				
	1	2	3	4	WS	1	2	3	4	WS	1	2	3	4	WS
Volume 1	3	5	2	0	19	6	2	2	0	16	5	3	2	0	17
Volume 2	(Not Administered)					5	4	1	0	16	7	1	2	0	15
Volume 3	(Not Administered)					8	2	0	0	12	6	3	1	0	15
Volume 4	9	0	0	1	13	9	1	0	0	11	7	3	0	0	13
Difference Vol. 1-4	6				-6	3				-5	2				-4

WS = Weighted score is frequency times the choice number (1,2,3,4). Perfect score is 10 for each volume. Group C reduced its score from 19 to 13 (-6) out of a possible -9 (.66); Group D, -5 out of -6 (.83); Group E, -4 out of -7 (.57). Development and use of table: Each vignette was analyzed for the group's preferred answer pattern by totaling the weighted score for each of the four alternative answers. The answer with the lowest total was given first place; second lowest, second place, etc. The correct answer was then identified according to its first to fourth placement for each vignette in the volume of 10 vignettes. The placements were then totaled for each volume. For example, Group C had 3 choices in first place, 5 in second place, 2 in third place, and none in fourth place for Volume 1. This procedure emphasizes the group's placement preferences and ignores the extent to which one answer was selected over the others, and differs from the "percent correct" analysis previously cited in this report. For example, Group E's increase in percent correct was 24 and greater than Group C's 21%; by this analysis Group E improved less than Group C. Group D demonstrated the greatest improvement with a near perfect score on the last volume.

TABLE 3

NUMBER OF SUBJECTS AND PER CENT CHOOSING ANSWERS A, B, C, AND D
FOR VOLUME I

Vignette	N	A	B	C	D	Page
1. The Open Door	27	07	04	04	(85)	1
2. The Godparents	43	07	(81)	05	07	6
3. But I Told Her	37	16	1	03	(81)	11
4. Old Folks at Home	44	01	05	18	(77)	16
5. New Girl in Town	43	05	09	16	(70)	21
6. The Bureaucratic Labyrinth	43	16	12	(65)	07	26
7. Play Ball	37	03	13	(57)	27	31
8. Divorce	37	01	11	38	(51)	36
9. Cribs and Scissors	43	(51)	26	05	19	41
10. Interpreter	37	16	(51)	22	11	46
11. Missed Days	37	01	24	(49)	27	51
12. Birth Control	37	16	22	(49)	13	56
13. Foster Care	37	(40)	11	40	08	61
14. The Wedding	43	09	(37)	35	19	66
15. Full House	36	(28)	05	01	67	71
16. Kiss the Baby	27	(19)	11	30	40	76
17. We Even Ate Frogs	37	03	16	(16)	65	81
18. Adios Senor Grant	27	07	44	(15)	33	86
19. Lady in Distress	27	(07)	52	26	15	91
20. Football Weekend	-	-	-	-	-	96

Correct answer in parenthesis.
Vignette No. 20 not tested.

TABLE 3 (cont.)

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS AND PER CENT CHOOSING ANSWERS
A,B,C, AND D FOR VOLUME II

Title	N	A	B	C	D	Page
1. Underfed, Overcrowded	27	1	4	(92)	4	1
2. La Mollera Caida	36	6	1	6	(89)	6
3. Jerry	43	(74)	9	14	2	11
4. Feeling Blue	37	32	14	1	(54)	16
5. Changing Subjects	37	5	(54)	3	38	21
6. Pots and Pans	27	22	15	7	(56)	26
7. The Debutante	27	4	(55)	15	26	31
8. Broken Bones and Bills	26	23	1	(50)	27	36
9. The Lessen of Two Evils	43	26	14	(51)	9	41
10. Wedding Bells	26	8	4	38	(50)	46
11. The Missed Appointment	43	(35)	5	28	33	51
12. Nursing Home	37	1	(35)	16	49	56
13. Three Equals No	27	11	(33)	11	44	61
14. Family Food Stamps	37	32	(32)	27	8	66
15. ¿Como Esta?	39	13	54	2	(31)	71
16. Montez	37	(30)	5	21	41	76
17. Barefoot and Pregnant	37	3	3	(24)	70	81
18. Dating Game	37	14	56	(19)	11	86
19. Senorita Espinosa	37	(11)	5	76	8	91
20. The Denial						96

Correct answer in parenthesis.
Vignette No. 20 not tested.